

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5 and 8-10, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Sato '221 (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,221).

By this Amendment, claims 3 and 8 have been amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced. As such, claims 3-5 and 8-10 are currently presented for examination, of which claims 3 and 8 are independent.

Insofar as the §102(e), rejections are still deemed to be relevant given the claim changes, Applicant traverses these rejections as follows:

I. Rejections Under §102(e).

As indicated above, claim 3 is directed to a perpendicular magnetic recording head and positively recites, *inter alia*, a *write shield detached and uncoupled to the main pole* on a trailing side to the main pole and *having a multilayered structure in which a nonmagnetic layer is sandwiched between magnetic layers*, the write shield comprising a central portion and edge portions along a track width direction and having such a shape that has a thickness that is larger in each of the edge portions than that in the central portion.

These features are amply supported by the disclosed embodiments of the written description. By way of example, the disclosed embodiments clearly describe and depict that the magnetic recording head has a structure in which the write shield is *detached and uncoupled* from the main pole. (*See, e.g.*, Specification: page 20, line 9 to page 24, line 2, and FIGs. 13-15, and 17). Armed with this detached structure, the suppression of a penetrating disturbance magnetic field into the write head can be achieved. (*See, e.g.*, Specification: page 15, lines 4-6).

Applicant, once again, submits that the asserted reference clearly fails to teach each and every element of claim 1, including the features noted above. In particular, the Sato '221 reference discloses that back section 24c of the main magnetic pole layer 24 and a front section 35b of the yoke layer 35 are *magnetically coupled* to each other, and a base 35c of the yoke layer 35 is *magnetically coupled* to the upper surface 25a of the connecting layer 25. (See, Sato '221: col. 8, lines 56-60; FIGs. 1, 2). In other words, the main magnetic pole layer 24 and the yoke layer 35 are *coupled to each other* via plating underlayer 35d as shown in FIG. 1.

As such, it cannot be denied that Sato '221 simply fails to suggest a *write shield detached and uncoupled to the main pole*, as required by claim 3. If anything, Sato '221 effectively teaches away from such a limitation. Indeed, as artisans of ordinary skill will readily appreciate, because the yoke layer 35 and the main magnetic pole layer 24 of Sato '221 are magnetically coupled to each other, Sato '221 is incapable of suppressing the penetration of a disturbance magnetic field into a write head.

The Examiner alleged that Sato '221 discloses a write shield having "a multilayered structure in which a nonmagnetic layer (34) is sandwiched between magnetic layers (35 and 24 - see Figure 2)." (See, Final Office Action: page 3, lines 12-14). Applicant strenuously disagrees.

Claim 3 specifically requires that the *write shield* have a *multilayered structure in which a nonmagnetic layer is sandwiched between magnetic layers*. The disclosed embodiments provide that the multilayered write shield suppresses the leakage field during the recording operation, which makes it possible to prevent the previously recorded signals from becoming deteriorated and erased.

In FIG. 2 of Sato '221, it is clear that the yoke layer 35 comprises a single magnetic layer while the nonmagnetic layer 34 is sandwiched between the yoke layer 35 and the main magnetic pole layer 24. As such, Sato '221 cannot be construed as suggesting that the *write shield* has a *multilayered structure in which a nonmagnetic layer is sandwiched between magnetic layers*, as required by claim 3.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Sato et al. is capable of teaching each and every element of claim 3. As such, claim 3 is clearly patentable over the

asserted reference. In addition, because claims 4-5 depend from claim 3, claims 4-5 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations.

Moreover, because claim 8 recites similar patentable features as claim 3, claim 8 is patentable for at least the reasons posited relative to claim 3. And, because claims 9-10 depend from claim 8, claims 9-10 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3-5 and 8-10 is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 03-3975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**

By: 

E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: February 25, 2008
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900